

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: August 21 2002
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of
August 21, 2002 (Meeting #29)

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Jay Cervený	City of La Center Council Member
Jeanne Harris	City of Vancouver Council Member
Michael Hefflin	City of Ridgefield Council Member
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Council Member
Debbie Smith	Town of Yacolt Council Member
Betty Sue Morris	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)

Public:

Marnie Allen	Consortium of Clark County Schools
Richard Cyr	Clark Public Utilities
Patty Grau	Hazel Dell Sewer District
Ken Hadley	Self
Jessica Hoffman	Clark County Association of Realtors
Bruce Lindoff	Self
Dean Lookingbill	RTC
Ken Navidi	Hazel Dell Sewer District
Ole Rasmussen	Self
Cheryl Richards	Meadow Glade Neighborhood Assn.
Tom Stafford	Meadow Glade Neighborhood Assn.
Carolyn Tecklenburg	Meadow Glade Neighborhood Assn.
Robert Tecklenburg	Meadow Glade Neighborhood Assn.
Mike Vinatieri	SWWHD

Staff:

Jose Alvarez	Clark County Long Range Planning
--------------	----------------------------------

Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Joanne Boys	City of Washougal Planning
Derek Chisholm	Clark County Long Range Planning
Bob Higbie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Mary Keltz	Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager
Oliver Orjiako	Clark County Long Range Planning
Rod Orlando	Town of Yacolt – EES Consulting
Matt Ransom	City of Vancouver Transportation
Kelly Sills	Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office
Marty Snell	City of Camas Planner
Bryan Snodgrass	City of Vancouver Planner
Suzan Wallace	City of Vancouver Economic Development

1. Introductions

2. Review June 26, 2002 meeting notes

Accepted as distributed.

3. Review of upcoming public Open House meetings.

Pat Lee handed out a letter that will be sent to those attending the prior meeting and the GMA mailing list (a list of about 1200 people). The format of the meetings will be similar to meetings held in the spring but will be in larger venues to accommodate larger turnouts. There will be three stations focusing on creation of jobs, environmental issues, and traffic and transportation. The focus areas were identified in the spring meetings as being priorities. While all the analysis has not been completed the idea is to identify existing conditions and potential trouble spots. The objective is to solicit input from the public about what they like or don't like in the alternatives, not a preference of an alternative. The meetings are scheduled from September 9th through the 19th.

4. Review/Update on Alternative Plan maps for consideration in EIS

The alternative plan maps have expanded from 3 alternatives last spring to include two new alternatives, one titled "2001 direction from the Board of County Commissioners" and a "Discovery Corridor" alternative based on the Columbia River Economic Development Council's economic development strategy. There are a total of five alternatives, in addition to the two new maps there are three other plans: "The 1994 plan", "The Cities Perspective" and "No Expansion of Existing Urban Areas".

Pat Lee provided a spreadsheet containing the assumptions that the alternative maps are based on and provided a brief summary of each alternative.

Alternative 1 has the largest boundary expansion due to the higher growth rate (1.83%) and lower persons per household figures. It maintains the existing plan policy of 60%/40% housing split between single family and multi-family. Demand for jobs is based on jobs to person ratio of 1 to 2.53.

Alternative 2 is the "Board's 2001 direction". Key assumptions include: no more than 75% of one housing type as opposed to the 60/40; a density for new housing of 4 dwelling units per acre for La Center, 6 dwelling units per acre for Camas, Battle Ground and Washougal and 8 dwelling units per acre for Vancouver; and a more aggressive jobs to population ratio of 1 to 2.3.

Alternative 3 is the "No expansion of existing Urban Areas". Key assumptions include elimination of the market factor; housing split of 71% single family and 29% multi-family; and reduction of infrastructure deduction from 38% to 27.5%. There are two rationales justifying the elimination of the market factor: (1) existing county policy that allows expansion of urban growth boundaries when thresholds of 75% of residential land or 50% of commercial/industrial land absorption are met (2) State law requires update of the comprehensive plan every 10 years to accommodate 20 years of growth. The housing split and infrastructure deduction are based on observed data from the Buildable Lands Report.

Alternatives 4 and 5 contain the most aggressive jobs creation approach and provides enough land to accommodate 70,000 new jobs by 2023. Alternative 4 is the "Cities Perspective". Alternative 5 is the "Discovery Corridor" approach and other than the more aggressive jobs strategy uses the same assumptions as Alternative 2.

Jeanne Harris asked whether the assumptions used were based on current on the ground data or macro assumptions? She was concerned that a discrepancy exists between the two and it creates a problem in sizing the City of Vancouver's capital facilities. Pat Lee responded that the question would be addressed in the housing and jobs allocation to TAZ section of the agenda.

Commissioner Morris asked what the key variables were in Alternative 2 that allows the growth to be contained within the existing urban areas? Pat Lee responded that the reduction in infrastructure and elimination of the market factor were the key variables that allow growth to be contained within the existing urban growth areas.

- **Housing and jobs allocated to Transportation Analysis Zone's – description of process**

Pat Lee began the discussion of the population and employment allocation by Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) with a review of the population allocation agreed to by the cities. He described the current impasse in the employment allocation by TAZ to be a result of a countywide control total of 70,000 jobs and the city of Vancouver's insistence that it can accommodate nearly all of the jobs within the city limits. Lee added that the 70,000 jobs represents a very aggressive job creation target and a jobs to population ratio of 1 to 1.5 which is significantly higher than the 1 to 2.9 ratio that the county has historically experienced. Lee felt an employment control total beyond 70,000 was unrealistic, and short of re-allocating the total, he's at a loss for reconciling the differences.

The City of Vancouver's position was represented by Jeanne Harris, Bryan Snodgrass, Matt Ransom and Phil Wuest. The City of Vancouver emphasized that the employment capacity within the city is based on development agreements that are in the pipeline, existing planned action ordinances and development at the Port of Vancouver. The City was adamant that their on ground assessment is more accurate than the macro assumptions used in the Vacant Buildable Lands Model and that an accurate representation of the employment capacity is essential to the city's ability to generate funding to size their capital facilities, particularly the transportation network.

Pat Lee, in response to the potential impact on the transportation network, commented that there are checks built into the process that include: a periodic review every 5 years, 10 years for urban growth boundary expansion and an update of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan every two to three years.

Questions arose regarding the apparent inconsistency between the City of Vancouver's expansion request for job creation and the increased capacity within the city limits? Bryan Snodgrass responded that the city was taking a very aggressive approach to increase the jobs/housing balance within the city.

Commissioner Morris commented that there is a concern that capital facilities will be undersized if we use the 1.5% growth rate and a potential solution would be to increase the growth rate.

Commissioner Morris asked the city of Vancouver how many jobs they could accommodate? Bryan Snodgrass responded that they could accommodate 17,000 jobs above and beyond what was allocated to the city by the county.

Pat Lee asked for an estimate of a county control total if the city of Vancouver's suggestion were followed? Bryan Snodgrass responded that it would be over 100,000 jobs in the next 20 years and it would be within the range provided by Scott Bailey.

Commissioner Pridemore asked where the increased capacity in jobs were located? Phil Wuest responded that there were several locations through out the city including Esther Short, NE 136th, and the Port of Vancouver.

Commissioner Stanton asked for comments from cities other than Vancouver. John Idsinga commented that Battle Ground agreed to take on an additional 8,000 population contingent on getting an equal share of employment.

Dean Dossett commented that the steering committee has had disagreements throughout the process, particularly the growth rate, that have been resolved but he feels that all of the cities need to play by the same rules.

Michael Hefflin added that he doesn't believe a .85 jobs to housing ratio is possible, irrespective of what is in the pipeline.

Pat Lee suggested that the City of Vancouver review the TAZ allocations and where there are concrete development agreements include those and eliminate those areas where development is not assured in the next 20 years.

Pat Lee suggested that the City of Vancouver could do a shadow allocation and then refine them as the process goes along. Dean Dossett suggested the city of Camas would also do a shadow allocation.

Commissioner Morris was hopeful that the cities would not challenge each other or the county's plans. She cautioned that legal challenges are expensive and ugly.

5. TAC update.

- **Request for Steering Committee direction on Urban Septic System model code.**

Bob Higbie requested that the Steering Committee consider whether the Urban Septic System model code brought forward in May was sufficient to present to all of the jurisdictions for adoption. He emphasized that the model ordinance is not intended to address the issues with existing septic systems rather the model ordinance is intended to discourage the creation of new septic systems in the urban area.

The Steering Committee agreed to send the model code to all of the jurisdictions for adoption.

Other

6. Next meeting date and time

Pat Lee suggests meeting on October 16th and will provide feedback from the September public meetings.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - August 21 2002(#29).doc